UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,616	07/11/2006	Kazuaki Nakamura	02860.1073	8531
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP			EXAMINER	
			ENG, ELIZABETH	
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/585,616	NAKAMURA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ELIZABETH ENG	4151
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory peri  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAN	TION.  y be timely filed  S from the mailing date of this communication.  DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) □ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) □ This action is application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the condition is in condition.	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matters	
Disposition of Claims		
4)  Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with description 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) <u>18</u> is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> are subject to restriction and/or contact the application Papers	rawn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrupt The oath or declaration is objected to by the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei     a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:     1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume     2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority docume     3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume     application from the International Bure     * See the attached detailed Office action for a least open content.	ents have been received. ents have been received in App riority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/N	nmary (PTO-413) /lail Date rmal Patent Application

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## **Claim Objection**

1. Claim 18 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 17. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

## **Election/Restrictions**

2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group 1, claims 1, 13-18, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst comprising a titanium halide and an organic aluminum, wherein claims 17 and 18 are duplicates of each other.

Group 2, claims 2, 13-16, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens utilizing a catalyst comprising titanium halide and an organic aluminum and a process that hydrogenates the polyolefin.

Group 3, claims 3,13-16, 19, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst comprising a solid powder A) comprising a reduced titanium halide, one of the formulas (I)-(III), an organic aluminum compound, and B) an organic aluminum compound.

Group 4, claims 4, 13-16, 20, and 29-31 drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method that are the same as claims 3 and 19, but with a final hydrogenation step.

Group 5, claims 5, 13-16, 21, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst comprising an organic aluminum compound, a reaction product of magnesium and titanium halide, and a Lewis base.

Group 6, claims 6, 13-16, 22, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method that are the same as claims 5 and 21, but with a final hydrogenation step.

Group 7, claims 7, 13-16, 23, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst system comprising A) a titanium-incorporating catalyst

comprising a) an organic magnesium compound b) a halide c) titanium halide, and B) an organic aluminum.

Group 8, claims 8, 13-16, 24, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method that are the same as claims 7 and 23, but with a final hydrogenation step.

Group 9, claims 9, 13-16, 25, and 29-31 drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst system comprising A) a titanium-incorporating solid catalyst comprising a) silanol b) a magnesium compound c) a titanium halide d) an electron-donating compound, and B) and organic aluminum.

Group 10, claims 10, 13-16, 26, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method that are the same as claims 9 and 25, but with a final hydrogenation step.

Group 11, claims 11, 13-16, 27, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method utilizing a catalyst system comprising A) a titanium-incorporating solid catalyst comprising a) silanol b) Grignard c) titanium halide d) electron-donating compound, and B) an organic aluminum.

Group 12, claims 12, 13-16, 28, and 29-31, drawn to an optical resin lens and a production method that are the same as claims 11 and 27 but with a final hydrogenation step.

- 3. The inventions listed as Groups 1-12 do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Each group is drawn to an optical resin lens and a process of making the lens from polyolefin. However, the groups do not share a corresponding special technical feature. Specifically, each group utilizes a different catalyst, making the resulting products of each group chemically distinct from each other. Furthermore, a hydrogenated polyolefin is chemically distinct from a nonhydrogenated polyolefin.
- 4. A telephone call was made to the attorney Ernest Chapman on 6/15/2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

5. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does

not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

  Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

  All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the

Application/Control Number: 10/585,616 Page 7

Art Unit: 4151

above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ELIZABETH ENG whose telephone number is (571)270-7743. The examiner can normally be reached on M-R, 8:30am-5:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wu can be reached on (571)272-1114. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/585,616 Page 8

Art Unit: 4151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ΕE

/David Wu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796